DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 854 FL 027 193

AUTHOR Hornberger, Nancy H.
TITLE Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of Its 25th Anniversary.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 30p.; In: Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 2001; see FL 027 192. Revised version of "Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program as It Approaches Its 25th Anniversary" in R. L. Cooper, E. Shohamy, and J. Walters (Eds.) "New Perspectives and Issues in Educational Language Policy: A Festschrift for Bernard Dov Spolsky" (see ED 457 697).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v17 n1-2 p1-26 Spr-Fall 2001
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Educational Research; Higher Education; Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Educational linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania's (Penn) Graduate School of Education traces its beginnings to 1976 and the deanship of Dell Hymes. This paper takes up various aspects of the practice of educational linguistics at Penn, discussing them in relation to issues that have been raised in the literature about the definition, nature, and scope of the field. Three emphases which have characterized Penn's educational linguistics are considered: the integration of linguistics and education (the relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse); the close relationship among research, theory, policy, and practice (a problem-oriented discipline); and the focus on language learning and teaching (scope with depth). The paper concludes with a consideration of educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines. (Contains 121 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 854

Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of Its 25th Anniversary

Nancy H. Hornberger

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics
v17 n1-2 p1-26 Spr-Fall 2001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Donnelly
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

FL027193

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Linguistics as a Field: A View from Penn's Program on the Occasion of its 25th Anniversary[1]

Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania

Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education traces its beginnings to 1976 and the deanship of Dell Hymes. This paper takes up various aspects of the practice of Educational Linguistics at Penn, discussing them in relation to issues that have been raised in the literature about the definition, nature, and scope of the field. Three emphases which have characterized Penn's Educational Linguistics are considered: the integration of linguistics and education ("the relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse"); the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice ("a problem-oriented discipline"); and the focus on language learning and teaching ("scope with depth"). The paper concludes with a consideration of educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines ("birds on a wire"). It is my hope that this exploration of a particular set of practices might contribute to the advancement of the field of educational linguistics.

Introduction

In 1972, Bernard Spolsky proposed the title "educational linguistics" for a discipline whose primary task would be "to offer information relevant to the formulation of language education policy and to its implementation" (1974c:554). He affirmed that it "should be a problem-oriented discipline, focusing on the needs of practice and drawing from available theories and principles of many relevant fields including many of the subfields of linguistics" (1975:347). Shortly thereafter, two doctoral programs in Educational Linguistics were inaugurated at U.S. universities – one at the University of New Mexico, directed by Spolsky and closely linked to the Navajo Reading Study being carried out there and one at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, inaugurated

[1] This is a slightly revised version of a paper that originally appeared in a volume honoring Bernard Spolsky: R. Cooper, E. Shohamy & J. Walters (Eds.) (2001) *New Perspectives and Issues in Educational Language Policy: A Volume in Honor of Bernard Dov Spolsky*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

under the aegis of Dell Hymes and the direction of Nessa Wolfson.[2]

Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania traces its beginnings to 1976, when Hymes appointed Wolfson lecturer in education and assigned her the task of creating the Educational Linguistics program, which would come to encompass not only the Ph.D. specialization but also a master's specialization in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), and soon thereafter (1978), another master's specialization in Intercultural Communication.[3] In the ensuing years, the program took on additional faculty: Teresa Pica, one of the first graduates of the program (Pica 1982), was appointed assistant professor and director in 1983[4] and I joined in 1985; after Wolfson's untimely passing in 1989, Rebecca Freeman was recruited as third member in 1992 and served until 2000.[5] As Educational Linguistics at Penn celebrates its 25th anniversary, it seems appropriate to take a retrospective and prospective look at this program's approach to the practice of educational linguistics.

In keeping with Spolsky's initial formulation that educational linguistics should take the practice of education as its starting point, I will begin from the practice of educational linguistics in the Penn program, moving from there to implications for the field as a whole (rather than the reverse). In the sections which follow, I take up various aspects of the practice of educational linguistics at Penn and discuss them in relation to issues that have been raised in the literature about the definition, nature, and scope of the field. I conclude with a brief comment on the relationship of educa-

---

[2] Recently, two other Educational Linguistics programs have been initiated. In the 1990s, the Monterey Institute of International Studies changed the name of the Department of Language Studies to Graduate School of Languages and Educational Linguistics (Leo van Lier, personal communication, 7 November 1998); the School offers advanced language courses (usually content-based in several disciplines) and masters' degrees in TESOL and TFL (Teaching Foreign Language), but no doctoral degrees. As of 2000, Stanford University School of Education offers a Ph.D. specialization in Educational Linguistics within the Social Sciences, Policy and Educational Practice area. At the University of New Mexico, Professor Leroy Ortiz, student of Bernard Spolsky, currently directs the Division of Language, Literacy and Sociocultural Studies which houses the Educational Linguistics program there. So far as I know, these, with the Penn program, constitute the only Educational Linguistics programs to date, although a number of related programs in Language and Literacy, Language in Education, or some variation thereof, emerged in the 1980s (more on that below).

[3] In the budget climate at Penn at that time, creating masters specializations alongside the doctoral specialization was seen as a wise strategic move, since the masters students could provide tuition dollars that would help support the doctoral specialization (Hymes, personal communication, 26 October 1998). All three specializations continue to operate to the present. While all form an integral part of the Educational Linguistics program, the focus here will be on the doctoral specialization only.

[4] Professor Teresa Pica is the single person with the longest affiliation to the program, having begun there as student shortly after its establishment and continued on as professor until the present. I would like to acknowledge here the profound influence Pica has had on the development of the program, on the professional development of its students, and indeed on my own academic career.

[5] As this article goes to press, Educational Linguistics again welcomes a third faculty member, Yuko Goto Butler, and is in the process of searching for a fourth to join in Fall 2001.

tional linguistics to applied linguistics and other disciplines. It is my hope that this exploration of a particular set of practices might contribute to the advancement of the field of educational linguistics.[6]

Educational Linguistics defined

The Educational Linguistics Ph.D. specialization at Penn is one of nine doctoral specializations offered at the Graduate School of Education. The Educational Linguistics handbook introduces the doctoral specialization in the following way:

> "The Ph.D. specialization in Educational Linguistics integrates scholarship, training, and research in linguistics as they relate to theory, practice, and policy in education. The specialization maintains a perspective on issues in linguistic and cultural diversity and approaches to language learning and teaching that embraces local, national, and international interests.
>
> Research interests of Ph.D. candidates currently enrolled in Educational Linguistics include: second language acquisition; language choice, maintenance and shift; language and ethnicity; descriptive analysis of speech acts and discourse; educational implications of linguistic diversity; language planning; bilingual education; spoken interaction in professional settings; and biliteracy. Graduates can expect to find teaching, administrative, and research positions in colleges and universities, and administrative, research and advisory posts in government, community and private organizations.
>
> All students enrolled in this program are expected to gain a solid foundation in linguistics. For this purpose, students take courses in the Department of Linguistics as well as in the Graduate School of Education" (Educational Linguistics Handbook 1999-2001:19).

The above introduction offers a brief definition of educational linguistics, as well as a suggestion of its scope and relationship to linguistics. The handbook goes on to outline a 20 course curriculum, including seven core courses, four distribution courses (two in linguistics and two in education), and two research methods courses, as well as inquiry skills, candidacy, comprehensive examination, and dissertation requirements.

[6] I write from the perspective of one affiliated with the program since 1985 as professor, for many of those years as director. Mine is in many respects a personal, and undoubtedly biased, perspective, but it also affords the benefits of insider knowledge.

Beginning with the first Educational Linguistics Ph.D. in 1981 (Zentella 1981), the Faculty of the Graduate Group in Education has approved more than 75 candidates for the Ph.D. degree with specialization in Educational Linguistics, approximately three-quarters of them women and over one-third international.[7] Consistent with the professional positions outlined in the above introduction to the program, graduates have gone on to hold academic, research, and administrative posts in institutions of higher education across the country and around the world, in departments of education, linguistics, applied linguistics, English, English as a second language, foreign language education, multilingual-multicultural studies, anthropology, Japanese language and literature, and Black and Puerto Rican studies, and in international and intensive English language programs, among others.[8]

The conception of educational linguistics enunciated in the program handbook, with its emphasis on the integration of linguistics and education, the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice, and on language learning and teaching as the core focus, is consistent with the field as it has been both explicitly and implicitly defined in the literature. Spolsky's definition, above, specifies that the discipline should focus on language education policy and implementation and that it should take a problem- and practice-oriented approach, and these are the crucial characteristics he returns to again and again in his writings. In introducing the section on educational linguistics in Current Trends in Linguistics, he writes that he and the contributors set out "to show how linguistics and its various fields can help define and solve problems that reflect the centrality of language in the educational process" (1974a:2024), again alluding to the focus on language in education, the problem-solving orientation, and the link to linguistics. In his volume entitled Educational Linguistics, he goes on to write that "the field of language education must depend on a wise, soundly-based, but modest set of principles and practices derived from the relevant theoretical and empirical disciplines. It is the primary task of the field I call educational linguistics to provide such a basis" (1978:175). Here again, he takes the practice of language education as a starting point and looks to educational linguistics to draw from relevant related disciplines to provide needed principles to guide that practice. Like Spolsky, Shuy also sees an important role for educational linguistics in relating linguistics and its subfields (e.g. sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics) to relevant teaching

[7] International doctoral graduates have been from: Botswana, Brazil, England, Germany, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, Taiwan, Turkey, and Zaire.

[8] Graduates hold tenure-track or tenured faculty positions at, for example, the following universities nationally and internationally: Georgetown, New York University, University of Florida, University of Illinois, University of Puerto Rico, University of Wisconsin, LaTrobe (Australia), University of Botswana, University of Rio de Janeiro (Brasil), Waseda (Japan), Suk Myung (Korea), Universiti Teknologi (Malaysia), Aga Khan (Pakistan), Donghwa (Taiwan), and Bogaziçi (Turkey).

and learning (1981:460), and Pica sees it as a problem- and practice- based field "whose research questions, theoretical structures, and contributions of service are focused on issues and concerns in education" (1994:265).

Others define educational linguistics implicitly by what is or is not included in their discussion under that title. Stubbs' volume entitled Educational Linguistics (1986) is perhaps the most elaborate of these (we will return to his view of educational linguistics below), but others have also approached it this way. Under the title of educational linguistics, Smitherman (1979) addresses herself to black linguistics, Suardiaz and Domínguez (1987) to mother tongue teaching, Myers (1994) to second language teaching, and Freeman (1994) and Brumfit (1997) to language teaching. None of them explicitly define what they mean in using the term, but by implication include their particular topic within the scope of the field; moreover, their discussions advocate the same emphases on the integration of linguistics and education, close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice, and a focus on language learning and teaching, as articulated in the more explicit definitions of the field above.

Van Lier, on the other hand, at the 1994 Georgetown University Round Table on Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence (Alatis 1994), approaches the definition of educational linguistics explicitly in terms of its substantive content, but posits that in fact it does not exist "as an academic field, subfield, profession or discipline" (1994:200). Following Bourdieu (1990), he defines a field as a "historically constituted area of activity with its specific institutions and its own language of functioning" (van Lier 1994:203) and suggests that for a field of educational linguistics to exist, there would have to be departments, programs, (doctoral) degrees, courses, textbooks, materials, and insights proper to it (1994:207). At the same conference (but speaking in reference to the field of language testing), Spolsky suggests that "to be considered a profession, a calling needs to have a number of attributes, such as professional associations, textbooks, training programs, journals, conferences, and certification" (1994:88). I suggest here that, based on a practice of 25 years and by criteria such as those proposed above, educational linguistics has indeed earned the right to be considered an academic field. We will consider the nature and scope of the field in terms of the three emphases alluded to above: the integration of linguistics and education ("the relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse"); the close relationships among research, theory, policy, and practice ("a problem-oriented discipline"); and the focus on language learning and teaching ("scope with depth"); after which, we will conclude with a consideration of educational linguistics as a discipline among other disciplines ("birds on a wire").

The relevance of linguistics for education and the reverse

Anthropological linguist Dell Hymes agreed to become Dean of the

Graduate School of Education because he "believe[d] profoundly in the need for change in the way we understand language, and in what we do with language in schools" (1980:139). It is not too surprising, then, that one of the first things he did was to inaugurate Educational Linguistics with the appointment of Wolfson. Educational Linguistics was housed in one of four newly created Divisions in the school, the Language in Education Division (LED), along with several existing programs which eventually became unified as the Reading/Writing/Literacy program. This alignment has enabled Educational Linguistics students to benefit from language education fields such as Reading and Language Arts, Children's Literature, Rhetoric, and Adult Literacy, fields that have traditionally been kept separate from language teaching.

Situating the Educational Linguistics and Reading/Writing/Literacy programs in close proximity and under one administrative head has over the years led to greater coherence and complementarity between them, to their mutual strengthening; indeed, as the literacy field has evolved to take social, cultural, political and historical context into account (e.g. Street 1984, 1993), it has become increasingly difficult and undesirable to separate the study of language and literacy practices in any setting, in any event. Evidence of this merging of interests can be seen, for example, in the student-edited Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, which announce all of the programs in the Language in Education Division and highlight a selection of divisional courses encompassing reading/writing/literacy as well as educational linguistics offerings, as follows: Sociolinguistics, TESOL Methodology, Structure of English, Educational Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, Language Diversity in Education, Multicultural Issues in Education, Classroom Discourse and Interaction, Language Planning and Language Policy, Social and Historical Perspectives on Literacy, Teaching Reading to Second Language Learners, and Forming and Reforming the Reading and Language Arts Curriculum.[9]

[9] Similarly, a number of Language and Literacy graduate programs / departments / divisions / centers have emerged in schools of education at various U.S. and international universities since the 1980s, including University of California at Berkeley (Language and Literacy), University of Arizona (Language, Reading, and Culture), and an increasing number of programs in Language, Literacy, and Culture, e.g. at University of Colorado - Denver, and University of Maryland - Baltimore County, among others, in the U.S. International examples include the Centre for Language and Literacy at the University of Technology in Sydney, Australia and the Centre for Language in Education at the University of Southampton, UK. Of course, there are myriad programs in applied linguistics or TESOL or bi(multi)lingualism-bi(multi)culturalism or literacy, but I am highlighting here specifically those programs that unite language education and literacy education concerns under one institutional umbrella. One set of programs that appear to have developed along very similar lines to the Language in Education Division programs at Penn are the Literacy and Bilingualism Research Groups and the Centre for Language in Social Life at the Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language, University of Lancaster, UK. More recently, Brian Street and colleagues at King's College London have configured a Language in Education department there, drawing explicitly on the model of Penn's Language in Education Division where Street has held a visiting appointment for more than a decade.

From its beginnings, Educational Linguistics also sought to maintain ties with the Department of Linguistics in the School of Arts and Sciences.[10] To this end, there are a number of institutionalized reciprocities. As mentioned above, Educational Linguistics requires that all its students take a minimum of two courses in Linguistics; for their part, the Linguistics department offers Educational Linguistics as one of eleven areas of study from which their students choose four for their qualifying examinations. Two Educational Linguistics faculty have been appointed members of the Graduate Group in Linguistics; and reciprocally, there have been secondary appointments of Linguistics faculty in the Graduate School of Education. Faculty of both programs serve as needed on dissertation committees or faculty review committees in the other program. Research articles by faculty in one program may appear on course syllabuses in the other and vice versa. There is informal interaction as well, including occasional invitations to present brown bag talks and participate in locally organized conferences or working papers series. Of course, as with any other innovation, and continuing program, there have been differences of opinion, and tensions, across programs both within and outside of GSE. On the whole though, there is acceptance of autonomy within programs and at the same time a mutual recognition of the relevance of one field to the other.

The proposal for a field of educational linguistics was premised on the mutual relevance of linguistics and education (Spolsky 1974a:2021). Van Lier spells this out, arguing for the relevance of education to linguistics in terms of (a) the way in which linguistics is taught to future and current teachers and (b) classroom interaction data for linguistic theories; and reciprocally for the relevance of linguistics to education in terms of (c) language and content teaching in first language / second language classrooms, (d) language across the curriculum, (e) school-community information flow and discourses, (f) school to work discourse transitions, (g) critical linguistics, power and control in classrooms and schools, and (h) classroom interaction, this last which he sees as the core of the educational process and of educational linguistics research (1994:204-207). As van Lier points out, though, the argument for the relevance of linguistics for education has on the whole been more readily apparent and accepted than the inverse relationship (1994:204).

In his text *Educational Linguistics* (1986), Stubbs takes a strong stance for the relevance of linguistics to education, arguing, in terms reminiscent of Spolsky's call for a problem-oriented discipline, for the value of a research paradigm in Kuhn's (1962) sense, which "tackl[es] a well-articulated set of problems in well-defined ways, with agreed standards of solution and explanation, and drawing on a consensus of theory" (1986:233-234). He points out that it is important to distinguish between language in education and linguistics in education (1986:34), referring to the need to study language

[10] Hymes was a faculty member in Linguistics and Wolfson had earned her doctorate there.

"in its own terms" (1986:232), as a discourse system, rather than treating "language at the level of isolated surface features, ignoring its abstract, underlying, sequential and hierarchic organization" (1986:243); and he suggests that discourse analysis can be applied to education in direct teaching about discourse and communication and in the study of classroom discourse (1986:31, cf. van Lier's 1a and 1b above). Stubbs' text addresses what educators (educationalists, in his usage) need to know about linguistics and how to teach it to them, taking up in turn such English language education problems as the teaching of vocabulary, reading, and writing.

While there has been a general consensus on the relevance of linguistics for education (and far less attention to the relevance of education for linguistics), there is less clarity and perhaps a certain wariness as to the nature of the relationship between them: is it application, implication, interpretation, or mediation? Coexistence, collaboration, complementarity, or compatibility (Pica 1997)? In his early programmatic statements, Spolsky argued that linguistics has applications to and implications for education (1974b:2034), both directly through language descriptions and secondarily through linguistic subfields like sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics (1978: 2-3; cf. Shuy 1981:460). Yet, he was careful to note that while linguistics can contribute language descriptions to inform language teaching, a description is not a prescription for teaching (1978:2-3) and he urged "steering clear of excessive claims that have caused so much damage to all concerned" (1974a:2021); he emphasized that educational linguistics "should not be, as it often seems, the application of the latest linguistic theory to any available problem" (1975:347), but rather a problem-oriented discipline focused on the needs of practice (see the next section below).

While the metaphor of "application" will probably be with us for a long time,[11] scholars have recently argued that a view of educational linguistics as applying - or even mediating or interpreting - linguistic theory for the practice of education suggests an inappropriately hierarchical view of the knowledge base of language teaching (Freeman 1997:194). Stubbs traces a shift in views on the relation between theoretical and applied linguistics in similar terms, from a view of applied linguistics as mediating (interpreting) theory for teachers, to the view that applied linguistics should develop its own model of language. He argues that analysts' (linguists') and users' (teachers') models are radically different and indeed must be so due to differing aims; analysts need precision for validity and users need a degree of imprecision in order to communicate effectively (Stubbs 1986:249).

"Educational linguistics cannot just be linguistic theory applied to educational practice, ... rather the relationship must be reciprocal and dynamic" (van Lier 1994:203; see also 1997:97, 101). Pica (1997) celebrates the growing number of relationships available to teachers and researchers, among them coexistence of activities, collaboration of efforts, complementarity of

[11] For one recent example, see Kachru 1994:19 on the application of educational linguistics for exploring the cross-cultural dimensions of world Englishes.

contributions, and compatibility of interests — an egalitarian reciprocity which may well serve as a model for theory and practice in the whole of the field of educational linguistics.

A problem-oriented discipline

A sampling of feature articles in Penn's Language in Education Division Newsletter of the past several years gives an indication of the practice-based interests and activities of Educational Linguistics faculty and students: a three-day institute on teaching and assessing math offered for teachers and administrators at a bilingual school in Philadelphia's Puerto Rican community (LED News, December 1999); a series of short courses on indigenous and intercultural bilingual education taught in South America (LED News, September 1998); an action research collaborative which studies and supports the implementation of a dual language education program at a Philadelphia middle school (LED News, July 1997); and a five-year teacher enhancement program that seeks to effect broad based and long range improvements in the development of children's science and math literacy skills at the elementary school level (LED News, Spring 1996). Educational linguistics, as practiced at Penn, is not only situated within a school of education, but is also grounded in schools and communities (local and non-local) and geared toward professional practice.

Coursework in the program consistently requires students to be in Philadelphia public or private schools or in adult English language / literacy teaching programs, whether for short-term observation or longer-term research projects, and program faculty maintain ongoing contacts and collaborations with teachers and staff of these institutions. The master's specializations in Intercultural Communication or TESOL (which many Educational Linguistics students complete en route to the doctorate) require internship and service outreach, respectively, as part of the comprehensive examination process. Most of the students enrolled in the doctoral specialization bring with them pressing (or incidental) questions of practice gleaned from their prior or ongoing teaching experience, questions which provide a focus and a prod for inquiry in the classroom and in their studies. Dissertation topics range from ethnographies of bilingual language and literacy practices at home and in school in both immigrant and indigenous language minority communities, to investigations of the acquisition of communicative competence in specific speech acts in ESL, to studies of language and culture learning in language immersion camps or foreign exchange programs, to explorations of the effects of particular tasks or interaction patterns on second language learning, to interpretive studies of the implementation and impact of language policy on language use and language teaching.

Pica notes that educational linguistics research has shed light primarily in two domains of practice: design and implementation of learner-centered,

communicative curricula (LCCC) and professionalization of the classroom teacher as decision-making educator. With respect to the former, Pica points out, educational linguists have identified and recorded language used in the professional, vocational and academic contexts toward which learners aim and they have also built on theories of communicative competence (1994:265). With respect to the teacher as decision-maker, educational linguists have carried out research which teachers can draw on to answer questions such as: (1) "how should a LCCC be organized with respect to classroom content and activities?" (1994:269), (2) "which types of classroom organization are effective in providing a social and linguistic environment for L2 learning?" (1994:274), and (3) "how can a LCCC be adjusted and enhanced when exchange of message meaning is not sufficient for L2 mastery?" (1994:276). Consistent with Spolsky's early formulations which opened the present paper, Pica emphasizes that educational linguistics offers no prescriptions, but rather a source of information that teachers can apply as they make decisions (1994:280). More recently, Brumfit (1997) suggests that there is a need for more research into teachers' (both language teachers' and other teachers') explicit beliefs about, and understandings of language in order to enable us to understand teachers' central role as educational linguists, that is, as conscious analysts of linguistic processes.

The view from Penn's Educational Linguistics program, as enunciated so clearly by Pica above, is one based in the practice of language learning and teaching. It is a view consistent with Spolsky's suggestion that "a more productive approach is to start with a specific problem and then look to linguistics and other relevant disciplines for their contribution to its solution" (1978:2). The problem areas Pica identifies are curriculum and teacher decision-making, problems also identified by Spolsky (along with materials development) in his description of an educational linguistics approach to the Navajo Reading Study begun in 1969 (1975:349-351; also 1974c).

The Navajo Reading Study was itself an attempt to address an even more fundamental problem - the language barrier to education, i.e. the instance where a child acquires a vernacular language informally and is required by the educational system to acquire a different, standard language (Spolsky 1974b:2029), a problem which recurs for millions of children daily, weekly, and yearly all over the world and is, as Spolsky suggested, a perennial pursuit for educational linguistics. Spolsky's book, Educational Linguistics (1978), is in effect addressed precisely to the range of issues which require attention in order to address the language barrier, as revealed in his chapter titles, ranging from sociolinguistic issues such as multilingualism, language situations and policies, language, society, and education, and speech communities and schools – to psycholinguistic considerations such as the nature of language, acquisition of language, what it means to know a language, and language, the individual, and education.

As with the general consensus on the relevance of linguistics for education mentioned in the preceding section, there is also a general consensus

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that educational linguistics must take (language) educational practice (rather than linguistics) as a starting point. Suardiaz and Domínguez begin from the contact between linguistics and a particular (language) educational problematic, that of mother tongue teaching (1987:162). Myers, "in an attempt to define more clearly what the subject of inquiry should be in the field of Educational Linguistics,... invited practitioners and students to voice their concerns around major classroom questions related to language..." (1994:193). Pakir, writing about multilingual Singapore, makes a plea for educational linguists to "worry less about educational and psychological perspectives and look for the larger goal of achieving success in bilingual education for the community" (1994:371), by which she appears to be calling for more attention to educational practice and less to linguistic theory. Even Stubbs, who on the whole begins from linguistics rather than education, introduces a number of the linguistic topics he takes up throughout the book on the basis that they (actually or potentially) present problems to educationalists: e.g. the teaching of vocabulary (1986:112); the model of language underlying the concept of oracy (ability in spoken language) (1986:142); the diagnosis of semantic pragmatic disorder (1986:174); and problematic characteristics of the English writing system (1986:224); and devotes his final chapter to "ways in which linguistic theory should take more account of practice" (1986:246).

In sum, educational linguistics takes as its starting point the practice of (language) education, addressing educational problems and challenges with a holistic approach which integrates theory and practice, research and policy. Stubbs recognizes this when he outlines description, theory, and practice as the three ways in which any linguistic topic of interest to educationalists must be approached (Stubbs 1986:7). Smitherman (1979) enunciated it clearly and early on with respect to formulating an adequate theory of pedagogy for African-American children (many of whom arrive at school speaking a vernacular language different from the standard), calling for a holistic approach to language that would encompass theory and research within a paradigm that allows for the analysis of speech and language systems in their socio-cultural reality, policy and planning that would put the study of black speech in school, address testing issues, and push for national policy affirming all languages and dialects, and implementation and practice that would adopt a theme of pedagogy and knowledge for liberation for the community, establish training in language and culture of blacks for all teachers, and promote recognition that "everybody needs communicative competence" (1979:210).

Scope with depth

Communicative competence, first proposed by Hymes in 1966 (1972) in reaction to Chomsky's (1965) use of the term competence in a much narrower sense, describes the knowledge and ability of individuals for appro-

priate language use in the communicative events in which they find themselves in any particular speech community. This competence is by definition variable within individuals (from event to event), across individuals, and across speech communities, and includes rules of use as well as rules of grammar. Hymes' functional and multiple conception of language ability and use in communicative context gave impetus to the development of not only a whole branch of sociolinguistics (the ethnography of communication) but also a language teaching movement (communicative language teaching), both of which have endured to the present.

The influence of these ideas on Penn's Educational Linguistics program is readily evident, perhaps most noticeably in the inclusive, sociocultural approach to language education practiced in the program, an approach which, among other things, emphasizes the learning and teaching not only of linguistically defined grammatical knowledge (rules of grammar) but also of culturally embedded ways of speaking (rules of use); acknowledges the role of not only the immediate interactional context but also the historical, sociocultural, economic, and policy context surrounding language learning and teaching; recognizes the value of learning and teaching not just one standard language variety, but multiple varieties and patterns of language use; and perhaps most importantly, addresses not just language learning and teaching per se, but also the role of language in the construction and negotiation of both academic knowledge and social identity. Hereinafter, I will signal this last triple emphasis (on language, content, and identity) with the phrase "(the role of) language (in) learning and teaching." [12]

At Hymes' very first meeting with the Faculty of Education in the spring of 1975 (before his actual appointment as dean), he announced his intention to develop two academic emphases under his deanship, namely educational linguistics and the anthropology (or ethnography) of education (Erling Boe, personal communication, 9 September 1998).[13] In the ensuing years, there emerged at GSE "an environment favorable to interests in language and anthropology/ethnography, involving a variety of people, some there only for a while" (Hymes, personal communication, 26 October 1998). We have mentioned above the inauguration of the Educational Linguistics program and the Language in Education Division as a reflection of his emphasis on educational linguistics; similarly, Hymes' goals with respect to the anthropology/ethnography of education were infused into the Edu-

[12] Wodak (1997: xii) makes a similar tripartite emphasis (language as subject of instruction, medium of instruction, and medium of identity construction), describing language as central in the socialisation process and in schools, as follows: "L1 which determines the identity and the intellectual and cognitive development of individuals; [L1] as mode for transfer of knowledge and for interaction between teacher and student; [and L1] as object of knowledge and critical reflection in both L1 and L2 education."

[13] As Associate Dean under Hymes, Professor Boe worked closely with Wolfson in strategizing on the fiscal and administrative dimensions involved in building Educational Linguistics; he also chaired the search committee that recommended the appointment of Wolfson as Assistant Professor of Education at GSE in 1978.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

cation, Culture, and Society Division (now a program within the Educational Leadership Division) and the Center for Urban Ethnography which hosts the annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, now going into its 23rd year. In both cases, the one emphasis has informed the other, and, indeed, a sociocultural approach to language and a linguistically-informed understanding of sociocultural context have permeated other parts of the school as well.[14]

In keeping with this inclusive, sociocultural view of language in education, the comprehensive examination in Educational Linguistics identifies six areas of coverage (of which students choose three to be examined on): microsociolinguistics; macrosociolinguistics; language teaching methods and program design/evaluation; language planning and policy / educational policy; language acquisition: first and second; and interdisciplinary perspectives on educational linguistics. Similarly, the *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, sixteen volumes of which have been published under student editorial direction since 1984, solicit papers on topics "ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition" (1997, Vol. 13, No. 2, inside back cover).

This inclusive, sociocultural view of communicative competence and communicative contexts is also reflected in the range of dissertation topics pursued in Penn's program, such as:

1) descriptions of native speaker and / or non-native speaker communicative competence for various speech acts and social networks and identities:

speech acts: Benander 1993 on positive evaluations, Billmyer 1990 on compliments, Boxer 1991 on indirect complaints, D'Amico-Reisner 1985 on disapprovals, Goldschmidt 1993 on favor-asking, Meyer 1996 on disagreements, Rabinowitz 1993 on offers, and Walter-Goldberg 1985 on jury summation.

social networks and identities: Adams 1998 on gesture in foreigner talk, Bender 2000 on the social reality of a dual language program in an urban elementary school, Citron 1996 on study abroad students in Spain, Jakar 1995 on Hebrew language immersion camp, Kabongo-Mianda 1990 on two Zairean children acquiring English, Kubota 1999 on ESL learners' construction and display of social identities in the language learning classroom, Lincoln 2001 on the educational experience of language minority children in a rural Arkansas school district, Morgan 1989 on the language of three generations of black women in

[14] The Education, Culture, and Society (ECS) division / program has been another site for linguistics at GSE, numbering among its faculty over the years such distinguished linguistic anthropologists as Shirley Brice Heath, Bambi Schieffelin, Katherine Woolard, Frederick Erickson and, currently, Stanton Wortham. The infusion of interests in language and ethnography extends beyond the LED and ECS divisions as well, as seen for example in the Psychology in Education Division, in the work of former faculty Michele Fine and Brian Sutton-Smith, as well as current faculty Howard Stevenson, Margaret Spencer, and Daniel Wagner. Wagner directs the Literacy Research Center and its affiliated National Center on Adult Literacy and International Literacy Institute, in which Educational Linguistics and Language in Education faculty and students collaborate heavily.

priate language use in the communicative events in which they find themselves in any particular speech community. This competence is by definition variable within individuals (from event to event), across individuals, and across speech communities, and includes rules of use as well as rules of grammar. Hymes' functional and multiple conception of language ability and use in communicative context gave impetus to the development of not only a whole branch of sociolinguistics (the ethnography of communication) but also a language teaching movement (communicative language teaching), both of which have endured to the present.

The influence of these ideas on Penn's Educational Linguistics program is readily evident, perhaps most noticeably in the inclusive, sociocultural approach to language education practiced in the program, an approach which, among other things, emphasizes the learning and teaching not only of linguistically defined grammatical knowledge (rules of grammar) but also of culturally embedded ways of speaking (rules of use); acknowledges the role of not only the immediate interactional context but also the historical, sociocultural, economic, and policy context surrounding language learning and teaching; recognizes the value of learning and teaching not just one standard language variety, but multiple varieties and patterns of language use; and perhaps most importantly, addresses not just language learning and teaching per se, but also the role of language in the construction and negotiation of both academic knowledge and social identity. Hereinafter, I will signal this last triple emphasis (on language, content, and identity) with the phrase "(the role of) language (in) learning and teaching." [12]

At Hymes' very first meeting with the Faculty of Education in the spring of 1975 (before his actual appointment as dean), he announced his intention to develop two academic emphases under his deanship, namely educational linguistics and the anthropology (or ethnography) of education (Erling Boe, personal communication, 9 September 1998).[13] In the ensuing years, there emerged at GSE "an environment favorable to interests in language and anthropology/ethnography, involving a variety of people, some there only for a while" (Hymes, personal communication, 26 October 1998). We have mentioned above the inauguration of the Educational Linguistics program and the Language in Education Division as a reflection of his emphasis on educational linguistics; similarly, Hymes' goals with respect to the anthropology/ethnography of education were infused into the Edu-

[12] Wodak (1997: xii) makes a similar tripartite emphasis (language as subject of instruction, medium of instruction, and medium of identity construction), describing language as central in the socialisation process and in schools, as follows: "L1 which determines the identity and the intellectual and cognitive development of individuals; [L1] as mode for transfer of knowledge and for interaction between teacher and student; [and L1] as object of knowledge and critical reflection in both L1 and L2 education."

[13] As Associate Dean under Hymes, Professor Boe worked closely with Wolfson in strategizing on the fiscal and administrative dimensions involved in building Educational Linguistics; he also chaired the search committee that recommended the appointment of Wolfson as Assistant Professor of Education at GSE in 1978.

cation, Culture, and Society Division (now a program within the Educational Leadership Division) and the Center for Urban Ethnography which hosts the annual Ethnography in Education Research Forum, now going into its 23rd year. In both cases, the one emphasis has informed the other, and, indeed, a sociocultural approach to language and a linguistically-informed understanding of sociocultural context have permeated other parts of the school as well.[14]

In keeping with this inclusive, sociocultural view of language in education, the comprehensive examination in Educational Linguistics identifies six areas of coverage (of which students choose three to be examined on): microsociolinguistics; macrosociolinguistics; language teaching methods and program design/evaluation; language planning and policy / educational policy; language acquisition: first and second; and interdisciplinary perspectives on educational linguistics. Similarly, the *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, sixteen volumes of which have been published under student editorial direction since 1984, solicit papers on topics "ranging from speech act analysis and classroom discourse to language planning and second language acquisition" (1997, Vol. 13, No. 2, inside back cover).

This inclusive, sociocultural view of communicative competence and communicative contexts is also reflected in the range of dissertation topics pursued in Penn's program, such as:

> 1) descriptions of native speaker and / or non-native speaker communicative competence for various speech acts and social networks and identities:
>
> *speech acts*: Benander 1993 on positive evaluations, Billmyer 1990 on compliments, Boxer 1991 on indirect complaints, D'Amico-Reisner 1985 on disapprovals, Goldschmidt 1993 on favor-asking, Meyer 1996 on disagreements, Rabinowitz 1993 on offers, and Walter-Goldberg 1985 on jury summation.
>
> *social networks and identities*: Adams 1998 on gesture in foreigner talk, Bender 2000 on the social reality of a dual language program in an urban elementary school, Citron 1996 on study abroad students in Spain, Jakar 1995 on Hebrew language immersion camp, Kabongo-Mianda 1990 on two Zairean children acquiring English, Kubota 1999 on ESL learners' construction and display of social identities in the language learning classroom, Lincoln 2001 on the educational experience of language minority children in a rural Arkansas school district, Morgan 1989 on the language of three generations of black women in

[14] The Education, Culture, and Society (ECS) division / program has been another site for linguistics at GSE, numbering among its faculty over the years such distinguished linguistic anthropologists as Shirley Brice Heath, Bambi Schieffelin, Katherine Woolard, Frederick Erickson and, currently, Stanton Wortham. The infusion of interests in language and ethnography extends beyond the LED and ECS divisions as well, as seen for example in the Psychology in Education Division, in the work of former faculty Michele Fine and Brian Sutton-Smith, as well as current faculty Howard Stevenson, Margaret Spencer, and Daniel Wagner. Wagner directs the Literacy Research Center and its affiliated National Center on Adult Literacy and International Literacy Institute, in which Educational Linguistics and Language in Education faculty and students collaborate heavily.

Chicago, Newman 1993 on language learning in the Russian Jewish immigrant community in Philadelphia, Pomerantz 2001 on Spanish-as-a-foreign-language learners' identity construction through the linguistic resources at their command; and Szpara 2000 on student teachers' talk about difference in an urban high school.

2) investigations of communicative contexts for second language, foreign language, and bilingual learning and teaching in language and content classrooms at elementary, secondary, and adult or higher education levels, including:

interaction and negotiation in second language learning and teaching: Berg 1998 on peer response in adult ESL writing classes, Boyd-Kletzander 2000 on giving ESL learners responsibility for shaping their own learning, Dessner 1991 on teacher feedback in ESL, Doughty 1988 on effect of instruction in acquisition of relativization in ESL, Futaba 1994 on learner interaction in second language learning, Holliday 1995 on native speaker-nonnative speaker negotiations in second language learning of syntax, Linnell 1995 on negotiation as a context for second language learning, Park 2001 on the effects of form and meaning-focused instruction on second language phonological acquisition, Silver 1999 on input, output and negotiation in second language acquisition, Tseng 1992 on peer participation in second language learning, and Wanmansor 1999 on the MOO (multi-object-oriented, synchronous computer communication) as an environment for ESL;

processes and models in second language learning and teaching: Boatman 1989 on perception and production in adult second language learning, Carrier 1999 on second language listening comprehension, Chen 2000 on first language transfer and second language proficiency in Chinese ESL learners' writing, Hwang 1989 on bidirectional transfer and markedness in Korean and English second language learning, Keenan 1993 on a connectionist model of second language acquisition, Kim 1992 on typological and transformational perspectives on ESL learning, Labov 2000 on German ESL learners' production of the short A and E vowel contrast, Nimmrichter 1997 on the role of universal grammar in German second language acquisition, Washburn 1992 with a Vygotskian perspective on fossilization in second language learning, and Young 1989 on variation in interlanguage morphology in Chinese speakers learning ESL;

foreign language learning and teaching: Chen 1997 on corrective feedback in foreign language learning (Chinese), Freire 1989 on teachers' theoretical framework and classroom practice in foreign language teaching (Portuguese) Gayman 2000 on language use and social interaction in a two-way immersion kindergarten classroom (French/English), and Kanagy 1991 on developmental sequences in foreign language learning (Japanese);

content learning and teaching: Berducci 1995 on science mentoring in the elementary school, Kaplan 1992 on the mutual influence of speaking and writing in classroom interaction, Kipers 1993 on the role of gender in teacher interaction Shah 2000 on the sheltered classroom as a context for second language learning, Sotillo 1991 on facilitating input comprehension in transitional colleg

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

courses for ESL students, and Tanner 1991 on questioning as a teaching strategy among international teaching assistants.

The inclusive, sociocultural view of communicative competence and contexts has also been the impetus for the program's research and practice initiatives on bilingualism and biliteracy in Philadelphia's diverse urban schools and communities, as well as in multilingual settings all over the world. The program has had a steady record of involvement since the mid-1980s with the Puerto Rican community in North Philadelphia (e.g. Hornberger 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992; Hornberger and Micheau 1993; Micheau 1990; Rubio 1994; Freeman 1999, 2000; Varghese 2000) and with Asian immigrant and Southeast Asian refugee communities in West and South Philadelphia (e.g. Weinstein-Shr 1986, 1993, 1994 on Hmong literacy; Chen 1992 on language maintenance and shift in the Chinese community; Hardman 1994, Hornberger and Hardman 1994, Hornberger 1996, and Skilton-Sylvester 1997 on language and literacy in the Cambodian community). In the early 1980s while she was an Educational Linguistics student, Gail Weinstein-Shr founded Project LEIF (Learning English through Intergenerational Friendship), an ESL tutoring service with particular outreach to older refugees, and it —and its successor SHINE— have since been staffed and directed by numerous other Educational Linguistics students.[15] These efforts in Philadelphia's diverse urban sphere have flourished under and also furthered overall Graduate School of Education (GSE) priorities, as exemplified in the Center for Urban Ethnography and in the recent Spencer Foundation Research Training Grant with its focus on urban education research.

Educational linguistics faculty have not only carried out research internationally, but have also consulted, lectured and taught in Bolivia, Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Japan, Peru, Singapore, South Africa, and Taiwan. Likewise, educational linguistics students have carried out research on the same wide range of topics noted above, and in many corners of the globe, for example:

Botswana: Language planning and education policy (Nyati-Ramahobo 1991)

Brazil: Peers as resource for language learning in foreign language context (Assis 1995)

Britain: Mainstreaming as language policy and classroom practice (Creese 1997)

[15] Project LEIF (now subsumed under Project SHINE and implemented nationally in five urban sites) has been described by its founder as "a model program developed at Temple University Institute on Aging's Center for Intergenerational Learning [through which] over 1,000 college-age volunteers have been trained to tutor English as a second language (ESL) to elder refugees and immigrants at community centers throughout the city; these include a Cambodian Buddhist temple, a Chinese community center, a Latino senior center, and a multicultural neighborhood center" (Weinstein-Shr 1994:120).

Cyprus: Turkish language reform in a language planning framework (Dogancay 1993)

Ecuador: Language revitalization in the Andes (King 1997)

Eritrea: Ideologies and methodologies in English language instruction (Wright 2001)

Israel: The social world of a preadolescent school class (Spiegel 1999)

Japan: Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations (Iino 1996); honorific use in everyday speech of Japanese women (Okushi 1997)

Kazakhstan: Identity planning and language orientation planning (DeLorme 1999)

Malaysia: Learning ESL: Reinforcing and suppressing factors in two communities (Razali 1992); Acquisition planning for English in tertiary education (Zakaria 1997)

Pakistan: Literacy practices in a rural community (Farah 1992)

Singapore: Production principles in non-native institutionalized varieties of English (Williams 1987)

Yugoslavia: Self-management and classroom interaction (Rosenfeld 1986).

These efforts have provided impetus for and are congruent with recent GSE priorities in international education. GSE's Office of International Programs and its Six Nation Education Research Project (SNERP) were inaugurated in 1993 and the UNESCO-sponsored International Literacy Institute (ILI) opened at GSE in 1994 under the auspices of the Literacy Research Center directed by Daniel Wagner. Educational Linguistics faculty have collaborated in the initiation and continuation of these international efforts and have involved students and alumni in them as well. As part of the SNERP Language Education and Literacy Project, Ph.D. candidates Leslie Harsch and Bruce Evans co-authored a report on the status of language minority education in the US which was published in volume 15 of *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics* (Hornberger, Harsch, and Evans 1999); and Ph.D. alumni Rita Silver '99 at the National Institute of Education in Singapore and Masakazu Iino '96 at Waseda University in Japan are participating in a six-nation study on pedagogical practices in English language education.

"The scope of the field of educational linguistics," Spolsky wrote, " is defined by the interaction of language and formal instruction" (1975:347), or, in a slightly more elaborated phrase, "the intersection of linguistics and related language sciences with formal and informal education" (1978:2). Like Hymes and Penn's Educational Linguistics programs, Spolsky's concept of educational linguistics begins from the concept of communicative

competence:

> "Educational linguistics starts with the assessment of a child's communicative competence on entering school and throughout his or her career, includes the analysis of societal goals for communicative competence, and embraces the whole range of activities undertaken by an educational system to bring its pupils' linguistic repertoires into closer accord with those expected by society. It thus is concerned with the processes used to bring about change, whether to suppress, enrich, alter the use of, or add, one or more styles, dialects, varieties, or languages" (1978:viii).

He mapped out on various occasions some of the areas encompassed within this scope, including child language acquisition, first (mother tongue) and second (or additional or foreign) language teaching, the teaching of reading/writing/literacy, bilingual education, the teaching of literature, and testing (1974a:2023; 1974b:2034; 1975:347; 1978:175; 1994:88). All of these have remained remarkably consistent topics in the field, as evidenced for example in the 1994 Georgetown University Round Table (Alatis 1994), which included, in addition to most of these, explicit attention to second language acquisition, language minority education, English as a world language, and the study of speech acts and discourse; and in the 1997 *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Corson 1997), whose eight volumes are devoted to language policy and political issues, literacy, oral discourse, second language education, bilingual education, knowledge about language, language testing and assessment, and research methods.

The scope of educational linguistics is, then, remarkably wide, but does not therefore sacrifice depth. Because of the functional and multiple conception of language in use which underlies it, there is constant attention to the possibilities of different meanings, different implications, different choices of language in particular contexts.[16] Hymes himself warned against the pitfall of scope without depth, noting that "simple models of rational actors and participants in discourse, while seeming to clarify experience, actually may obscure and mystify it ... Rational choice, propositional clarity, clear turn taking, and the like are not models from which to predict the movement of participant-particles, but half of a dialectic between conven-

[16] This emphasis on meanings and choice is consistent with a plea issued by Christie (1994) for an educational linguistics which would operate with a model of language in terms of a resource for meaning (following Hallidayan systemic functional linguistics), rather than in terms of 'rules' (1994:122); Penn Educational Linguistics emphases on meanings and choice are also consistent with, indeed as I argue here, informed by both Hymes' notion of communicative competence and Spolsky's concept of educational linguistics, Christie's reservations notwithstanding (1994:100, 106).

tion and choice" (1986:87-88).

Birds on a wire

Such a dialectic is also at play in the interaction among academic disciplines. Since there is no one "conventional" choice for professional affiliation for educational linguists, Penn's Educational Linguistics faculty and students participate in a wide array of professional associations. Faculty and students are members and regular presenters at, for example, the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the American Association for Applied Linguistics (AAAL), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the Linguistic Society of America (LSA), the National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE), New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English (NWAVE), the Second Language Research Forum (SLRF), the Sociolinguistics Symposium, and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), among others. Similarly, they subscribe to, publish in, and serve on the editorial boards of myriad professional journals such as *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, Anthropology and Education Quarterly, Applied Linguistics, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, International Journal of the Sociology of Language, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, Language and Education, Language in Society, Language Learning, Language Problems and Language Planning, Language Teaching Research, Linguistics and Education,* and *TESOL Quarterly,* to name only a few of the most frequently consulted. These multiple affiliations provide for constant interchange among the many disciplines which inform the field of educational linguistics, primary among them linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, applied linguistics, anthropology, and education; and they also provide multiple forums in which the voices and concerns of educational linguists are heard.

Van Lier uses the very apt metaphor of birds on a wire to characterize the shifting and repositioning that goes on among academic disciplines when a new one joins their midst; he also observes that "if they refuse to budge, the newcomer will have to fly off again" (1994:203-204). The foregoing sections of this paper suggest, I think, that educational linguistics has indeed found a place on the wire amidst its peer disciplines.[17] In his proposal for the field of educational linguistics, Spolsky had suggested that it would constitute a subfield of applied linguistics, the latter inclusively defined as "the cluster of fields embracing all studies of language

[17] The growing visibility of educational linguistics as a field is illustrated by tenure-track faculty search advertisements posted in the past several years, e.g. one by the University of California at Berkeley for an Assistant Professor in Educational Linguistics, and another by the University of New Mexico for an Assistant Professor in Native American Educational Sociolinguistics, whose responsibilities would include "mentoring of Native American and other students of educational linguistics." Another index is the emergence of electronic listserves using the name educational linguistics, such as edling@education.leeds.ac.uk or the former edlingo@dolphin.upenn.edu.

intended to be directly and immediately relevant to some social, educational, political, literary, or commercial goal" (1974c:553). He also identified two reasons why he preferred the title educational linguistics to applied linguistics: one, that applied linguistics includes some topics that may be outside of educational linguistics, such as "translation, lexicography, language planning"; and two, that the assumption that linguistics can be directly applied to education is problematic (1978:1). Shuy, too, wanted to differentiate educational linguistics from applied linguistics; indeed, he wanted to substitute the former term for the latter, because he felt that applied linguistics had become misunderstood to mean only ESL, the teaching of English as a Second Language (1981:458). Finally, van Lier was concerned that the 1980s had seen the development of a serious rift in the field of applied linguistics, between SLA researchers who distanced themselves from practice and teacher researchers who emphasized a strong pedagogical focus (1994:202).

From today's perspective, none of these concerns seems any longer relevant. A glance at the topic areas for the 2002 AAAL conference reveals a list very similar to, if somewhat more elaborated than, the ones presented earlier for educational linguistics, to wit: language and its acquisition, language and assessment, language and the brain, language and cognition, language and culture, language and ideology, language and instruction, language and interaction, language and listening, language and media, language and policy, language and reading, language and research methodology, language and society, language and speaking, language and technology, language and translation/interpretation, language and writing (to which I might add: language and identity, language and socialization) . It appears that applied linguistics is no longer solely identified with ESL, nor is it split between theory and practice. Neither is it necessarily wider in scope than educational linguistics;[18] even applications of linguistics for social, political, literary, or commercial ends (following Spolsky above) may ultimately relate to education in one way or another. The core differences between applied linguistics and educational linguistics, and they are not negligible ones, are the focus and starting point for the discipline. In educational linguistics, the starting point is always the practice of education and the focus is squarely on (the role of) language (in) learning and teaching. It is on those important differences that the argument for educational linguistics as a separate field rests, and it is in addressing those important challenges that the field of educational linguistics has its work cut out for many years to come.

[18] Van Lier sees educational linguistics as a sub-classification of applied linguistics, in turn a sub-classification of linguistics, while acknowledging that this hierarchical nomenclature may not satisfy all of his colleagues (1997:95).

References

Adams, T. (1998). *Gesture in foreigner talk*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Alatis, J. E. (Ed.). (1994). *Educational Linguistics, Crosscultural Communication, and Global Interdependence*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Assis, A. A. (1995). *Peers as a resource for language learning in the foreign language context: Insights from an interaction-based study*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Benander, R. (1993). *Communicative competence in second language acquisition: Noticing and choosing to perform positive evaluation speech acts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Bender, L. A. (2000). *Language planning and language policy: The interpretation and implementation of a dual language program in an urban, public school*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Berducci, D. (1995). *Internalization and structure of science mentoring: An analysis following Vygotsky and Pike*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Berg, C. (1997). *The effects of trained peer response on writing quality, revision strategies, and peer talk about ESL texts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Billmyer, K. (1990). *The effects of formal instruction on the development of sociolinguistic competence: The performance of compliments*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Boatman, D. (1989). *An investigation of adult second language perception and production: Evidence for and against a predictive account*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Boxer, D. (1991). *A descriptive analysis of indirect complaint sequences among speakers of American English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Boyd-Kletzander, R. (2000). *An inquiry into language learning: When ESL students are given responsibility for shaping their own learning*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Brumfit, C. (1997). The teacher as educational linguist. In L. van Lier & D. Corson (Eds.), *Knowledge about Language* (Volume 6 of the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, pp. 163-172). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Carrier, K. A. (1999). *The learner-interlocutor relationship as a factor in second language listening comprehension: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, F. J. (2000). *The roles of first language transfer and second language proficiency in the writing of Chinese learners of English as a second language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, H. H. (1997). *A study of the effect of corrective feedback on foreign language learning: American students learning Chinese classifiers*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chen, S. (1992). *Language maintenance and shift in the Chinese community of Greater Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Christie, F. (1994). Developing an educational linguistics for English language teaching: A systemic functional linguistic perspective. *Functions of Language*, 1(1), 95-127.

Citron, J. (1996). *The cross-cultural re-entry experiences of short-term study abroad stu-*

dents from the U.S. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Corson, D. (Ed.). (1997). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Creese, A. (1997). *Mainstreaming as language policy and classroom practice: An interpretive study of partner teachers' roles, relationships, and talk in multilingual British secondary schools*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

D'Amico-Reisner, L. (1985). *An ethnolinguistic study of disapproval exchanges*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

DeLorme, S. (1999). *Mother tongue, mother's touch: Kazakhstan government and school construction of identity and language planning*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dessner, L. E. (1991). *English-as-a-second-language college writers' revision responses to teacher written comments*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dogançay, S. (1993). *Turkish language reform in a language planning framework: Its impact on language use of Turkish Cypriot high school students*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dogançay-Aktuna, S. (1995). An evaluation of the Turkish language reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 19(3), 221-249.

Doughty, C. (1988). *The effect of instruction on the acquisition of relativization in English as a second language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Educational Linguistics Handbook 1999-2001. Language in Education Division. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Farah, I. (1992). *Literacy practices in a rural community in Pakistan*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Freeman, D. (1994). Educational linguistics and the knowledge base of language teaching. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 180-196). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Freeman, R. (1999). *Legitimizing Spanish and Spanish speakers in North Philadelphia: A microethnographic analysis in a dual-language classroom*. Unpublished manuscript.

Freeman, R. (2000). Contextual challenges to dual-language education: A case study of a developing middle school program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 202-229.

Freire, A. (1989). *Communicative competence as the goal of foreign language teaching: Teachers' theoretical framework and classroom practice*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Futaba, T. (1994). *Second language acquisition through negotiation: A case of non-native speakers who share the same first language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Gayman, S. M. (2000). *Understanding language use and social interaction in a French/English two-way immersion classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Goldschmidt, M. (1993). *For the favor of asking: A sociolinguistic analysis*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hardman, J. (1994). *Language and literacy development in a Cambodian community in Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Holliday, L. (1995). *Native speaker syntactic modifications in native speaker - nonnative speaker negotiation as input data for second language acquisition of syntax*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271-296.

Hornberger, N. H. (1990). Creating successful learning contexts for bilingual literacy. *Teachers College Record*, 92(2), 212-229.

Hornberger, N. H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. García (Ed.), *Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (pp. 215-234). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishers.

Hornberger, N. H. (1992). Biliteracy contexts, continua, and contrasts: Policy and curriculum for Cambodian and Puerto Rican students in Philadelphia. *Education and Urban Society*, 24(2), 196-211.

Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Mother tongue literacy in the Cambodian community of Philadelphia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 119*, 69-86.

Hornberger, N. H., & Hardman, J. (1994). Literacy as cultural practice and cognitive skill: Biliteracy in a Cambodian adult ESL class and a Puerto Rican GED program. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult Biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 147-169). Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hornberger, N. H., Harsch, L., & Evans B. (with assistance from Melisa Cahnmann) (1999). Language education of language minority students in the United States. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 15*(1), 1-92.

Hornberger, N. H., & Micheau, C. (1993). "Getting far enough to like it": Biliteracy in the middle school. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*(1), 30-53.

Hwang, S. (1989). *Bidirectional transfer and markedness: Acquisition of Korean and English as L2*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hymes, D. H. (1980). *Language in Education: Ethnolinguistic Essays*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hymes, D. H. (1986). Discourse: Scope without depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 57*, 49-89.

Iino, M. (1996). *"Excellent foreigner!": Gaijinization of Japanese language and culture in contact situations: An ethnographic study of dinner table conversations between Japanese host families and American students*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Jakar, V. (1995). *A society contained, a culture maintained: An ethnography of second language acquisition in informal education*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kabongo-Mianda, K. (1991). *Child interlanguage discourse: the role of peer interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kachru, B. B. (1994). The speaking tree: A medium of plural canons. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 6-22). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Kanagy, R. (1991). *Developmental sequences in the acquisition of Japanese as a foreign language: The case of negation*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kaplan, M. (1992). *Writing as listening: The mutual influence of speaking and writing in classroom interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Keenan, T. (1993). *A connectionist model of second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kim, K. (1991). *Relative clause realization, categorization, and acquisition in English as a second language: The case of genitive relative clause*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

King, K. A. (1997). *Language revitalization in the Andes: Quichua instruction, use, and identity in Saraguro, Ecuador*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kipers, P. (1993). *The role of gender in conversation: Some insights from a community of teachers*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kubota, M. (1999). *Choice of performed identities: Negotiating, constructing and displaying identities in an adult ESL classroom for teaching and learning communicative competence*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Labov, J. L. (2000). *The Roles of distinctive and redundant features in the production of the short A and E vowel contrast by L1 German speakers of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

LED News (1993? – 1999). The Language in Education Division Newsletter. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Lincoln, F. (2001). *Language minority populations twice neglected: A critical ethnographic study of language education policy and practice in Middle America*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Linnell, J. (1995). *Negotiation as a context for learning syntax in a second language*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Meyer, T. W. (1996). *Language and power in disagreements: Analyzing the discourse of male, female, and male/female couples*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Micheau, C. (1990). *Ethnic identity and ethnic maintenance in the Puerto Rican community of Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Morgan, M. (1989). *From down south to up south: The language behavior of three generations of black women residing in Chicago*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Myers, M. J. (1994). Various perspectives on educational linguistics gleaned from a collaborative project on the use of dictionaries. *Language Awareness*, 3(3&4), 193-200.

Newman, J. (1993). *Ethnography, classrooms, and social networks in the Russian Jewish immigrant community of northeast Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Nimmrichter, S. (1997). *The role of universal grammar in second language acquisition: explaining variability of verb placement in L2 German*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Nyati-Ramahobo, L. (1991). *Language planning and education policy in Botswana*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Okushi, Y. (1997). *Patterns of honorific use in the everyday speech of four Japanese women*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pakir, A. (1994). Educational linguistics: Looking to the East. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 370-383). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Park, J. K. (2001). *The effects of forms and meaning-focused instruction on second language phonological acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pica, T. (1982). *Second language acquisition in different language contexts*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Pica, T. (1994). The language educator at work in the learner-centered classroom: Communicate, decision-make, and remember to apply the (educational) linguistics. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Lan-*

guages and Linguistics 1994 (pp. 264-288). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Pica, T. (1997). Second language teaching and research relationships: a North American view. *Language Teaching Research, 1*(1), 48-72.

Pomerantz, A. (2001). *Beyond the good language learner: Ideology, identity, and investment in classroom foreign language learning*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rabinowitz, J. (1993). *A descriptive study of the offer as a speech behavior in American English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Razali, N. (1992). *Learning ESL in Malaysia: A study of reinforcing and suppressing factors in two communities*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rosenfeld, M. (1986). *Yugoslav self-management and classroom interaction*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Rubio, O. (1994). *"Una buena educación" : A study of parental values, beliefs, and aspirations in a dual-language school*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Shah, I. (2000). *The sheltered classroom as a context for second language learning process and outcomes*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Shuy, R. W. (1981). Educational linguistics. *Neuren Sprachen, 80*(5), 455-468.

Silver, R. E. (1999). *Learning conditions and learning outcomes for second language acquisition: Input, output, and negotiation*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Skilton-Sylvester, E. (1997). *Inside, outside, and in-between: Identities, literacies, and educational policies in the lives of Cambodian women and girls in Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Smitherman, G. (1979). Toward educational linguistics for the first world. *College English, 41*(2), 202-211.

Sotillo, S. M. (1991). *Input, interaction, content and language learning in the bridge classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Spiegel, J. (1999). *"It's My Life": Independence, cohesion, and tensions in the social world of an Israeli preadolescent school class*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Spolsky, B. (1974a). Linguistics and education: An overview. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 2021-2026). The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, B. (1974b). Linguistics and the language barrier to education. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 2027-2038). The Hague: Mouton.

Spolsky, B. (1974c). The Navajo Reading Study: An illustration of the scope and nature of educational linguistics. In J. Qvistgaard (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics: Problems and Solutions* (Vol. 3, pp. 553-565). Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

Spolsky, B. (1975). Linguistics in practice: The Navajo Reading Study. *Theory into Practice, 14*(5), 347-352.

Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational Linguistics: An Introduction*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

Spolsky, B. (1994). The beginning of language testing as a profession. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 88-101). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Street, B. (1984). *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. (Ed.). (1993). *Cross-Cultural Approaches to Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stubbs, M. (1986). *Educational Linguistics*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Suardiaz, D. E., & Domínguez-Colavita, F. (1987). Aportes a la lingüística educacional: La lengua materna en la educación elemental. *Revista Argentina de Lingüística, 3*(2), 161-169.

Szpara, M. Y. D. (2000). *Talk among student teachers in an urban high school: Questioning dimensions of difference*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Tanner, M. W. (1991). *NNSTA-student interaction: An analysis of TAs' questions and students' response in a laboratory setting*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Tseng, S. D. (1992). *Adding a third language: An in-depth analysis of the teacher questioning processes in a Chinese classroom*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

van Lier, L. (1994). Educational linguistics: Field and project. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1994* (pp. 197-209). Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

van Lier, L. (1997). Apply within, apply without? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 95-105.

Varghese, M. (2000). *Bilingual teachers-in-the-making: Advocates, classroom teachers, and transients*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Walter-Goldberg, B. (1985). *Jury summation as speech genre: An ethnographic study of what it means to those who use it*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Wanmansor, F. (1999). *Interaction on the network: A case of PennMOO among ESL learners*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Washburn, G. (1991). *Fossilization in second language acquisition: A Vygotskian perspective*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1986). *From mountaintops to city streets: An ethnographic investigation of literacy and social process among the Hmong of Philadelphia*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1993). Literacy and social process: A community in transition. In B. Street (Ed.), *Cross-cultural Approaches to Literacy* (pp. 272-293). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weinstein-Shr, G. (1994). Literacy and second language learners: A family agenda. In D. Spener (Ed.), *Adult Biliteracy in the United States* (pp. 111-122). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Williams, J. (1987). *Production principles in non-native institutionalized varieties of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Wodak, R. (1997). Introduction. In R. Wodak and D. Corson (Eds.), *Language Policy and Political Issues in Education* (Volume 1 of the Encyclopedia of Language and Education, pp. xi-xiv). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Working Papers in Educational Linguistics (1984 to present). Volumes 1(1) – 16 (1). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education.

Wright, M. (2001). *Ideologies and methodologies in language and literacy instruction in postcolonial Eritrea*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Young, R. (1989). *Variation in interlanguage morphology: (s) plural marking in the speech of Chinese learners of English*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zakaria, M. H. (1997). *Acquisition planning for English: A case in Malaysian tertiary education*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Zentella, A. C. (1981). *"Hablamos los dos. We speak both": Growing up bilingual in El Barrio*. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Dr. Nancy H. Hornberger is Professor of Education and Director of Educational Linguistics at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education. Her research interests are in sociolinguistics, language planning, bilingualism, biliteracy, and educational policy and practice for indigenous and immigrant language minorities in the United States, Latin America, and internationally.

FL27193

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").